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0 Introduction

0.1 My purpose in this paper will be to contest the notion of 'Surface Structure Constraints' as to its necessity for the solution of the clitic problem; a problem brought to our attention by the work of Perlmutter (1971), (ftn.1).

0.2 I shall not attempt, however, to prove that surface structure constraints are not necessary within the context of a transformational theory of grammar premising the ordered rule hypothesis. As a matter of fact I tend to agree with Perlmutter's conclusion that within the context of such a theory surface structure constraints are indeed necessary. His lucid and logical argumentative treatment of the clitic problem in Walbiri, French and Spanish bears ample proof to such a conclusion. I happen though to dissent from accepting the notion of a system of grammar such as Perlmutter premises in his work.

I shall therefore not attempt to prove my thesis by pointing out contradictions in Perlmutter's logical approach; for contradictions are to be considered as such only within the system in which they develop, and when the premises of that very system are a-priori refuted, as is the case here, the argumentation dialogue is necessarily somewhat blocked.

Nor shall I attempt to prove my thesis by pointing out inconsistencies in Perlmutter's data; for I tend to believe that his data are quite reliable, although in a few instances our consideration of their semantic evaluation differs basically.

0.3 This leaves me with one last option: to develop that portion of a new system of grammar, which I shall tentatively call here 'Modular Linguistics', in which all of Perlmutter's clitic data, together with other clitic data as well, are satisfactorily explained.

Modular Linguistics as a self-contained theory of language will not be presented here. I do not expect this, however, to affect in any negative way the conclusions of this study or the comprehension of its new approach.

The languages which were researched for this study are: English, Arabic, French, Spanish, Walbiri, Albanian, Italian, German, Russian, Persian, Czech, Japanese, Indonesian and Thai, of which the latter three do not exhibit clitics of the kind under consideration in this paper.

I shall prove that a specific clitic surface-feature, which I term 'Homonymic Ambiguity' and symbolize as $C^k$, is primarily the only feature controlling the final surface clitic order in the above-mentioned languages. The data for English, Arabic, Walbiri, French and Spanish will be presented in detail. Due to space considerations, the remaining languages will only be sparingly commented upon.

In order to prove my thesis I shall proceed to:

1. define $C^k$,  
2. develop the new notion of a 'Clitic Linguistic Module', henceforth C-lem and define the mechanism of its functioning
in terms of $C^k$, and indicate its position in the derivation process of the surface clitic order.

3. finally embark on the consideration of clitic data in different languages and the solution to our problem.

4. I shall then close with some considerations of a general nature.

1. $C^k$-definitions

1.1 The 'Pronominal and Clitic Systems' of English, Arabic, French and Spanish, henceforth the PCS of the specific language, as well as their respective C-legms are given in the Appendix at the end of this paper.

Depicted as PCS-rows are the NPG clitic subsets, where in general,

- $N$: Number = (Singular, Dual, Plural)
- $P$: Person = (First, Second, Third)
- $G$: Gender = (Masculine, Feminine, Neutral, Impersonal)

and where R stands for 'Reflexive'.

For instance, in French, P3M is the Plural 3rd person masculine pronoun and clitic subset.

Depicted as PCS-columns are the semantic constituent subsets $C^k$ where $(k = 0, 1, 2, 3)$, and which, in order to keep with current terminology, are rendered throughout this paper respectively as

$$0^k = (0^0, 0^1, 0^2, 0^3)$$

- $(\text{Agent, Patient}^1, \text{Patient}^2, \text{Patient}^3)$
- $(\text{Nominative, Accusative, Dative}^1, \text{Dative}^3)$
- $(\text{Subject, Direct Object, Indirect Object, Beneficial Object})$
- $(\text{Sbj, DO, IO, BO})$

i.e. the superscript $(k = 0, 1, 2, 3)$ respectively denotes the semantic constituents ultimately giving rise to $(\text{Sbj}, \text{DO, IO, BO})$.

Each $0^k$-column has two subcolumns: the pronoun set $\text{Pro}^k$ and the corresponding clitic set $C^k$.

The Agent/Subject and Patient/Object identification in the above will be dwelled upon under 2.1.

The subscript 'i' in $C^k$ indicates the 'Homonymic Ambiguity Value' of the clitic under consideration; a value presently to be defined under 1.2.

We can see from the PCS that for French P3M we have:

For $(k = 0, 1, 2, 3)$, $\text{Pro}^k = \{\text{ils, eux, eux, eux}\}$ and $C^k = \{\text{ils}_{0}, \text{ils}_{1}, \text{leur}_{1}, \text{leur}_{s}\}$

1.2 The following $C^k$-clitic-subset definitions rest on the consideration of clitic homonymy within each single NPG-row:

- $C^0$ is the subset of Sbj clitics not homonymous with any of DO or BO clitics, e.g. Spanish S2 'tu' and French P3M 'ils'.

- $C^1$ is the subset of DO clitics not homonymous with any of BO, IO or Sbj clitics, e.g. Spanish S3F 'la'.

- $C^2$ is the subset of IO clitics not homonymous with any of BO, DO or Sbj clitics.

- $C^3$ is the subset of BO clitics not homonymous with any of IO, DO or Sbj clitics.

- $C_1$ is the subset of homonymous BO and IO clitics not homonymous with any of DO or Sbj clitics, e.g. French S3M 'lui' and P3M 'leur'.

- $C_2$ is the subset of homonymous BO and DO clitics not homonymous with any of IO or Sbj clitics.
C3 is the subset of homonymous IO and DC clitics not homonymous with any of BO or Sbj clitics.

C4 is the subset of homonymous BO, IO and DO clitics not homonymous with Sbj clitics, e.g. Spanish P1 'nos', Spanish dialect II (DII) S2 'te', French S1 'me' and all of the English and Arabic clitics.

C5 is the subset of homonymous BO, IO, DO and Sbj clitics, e.g. Spanish S3I 'se' and Spanish dialect I (DI) S2 'te'.

In the above definitions I have not considered any other logically possible C₁'s, for such did not occur in any of the languages researched for this paper and I suspect that they do not occur at all in any other natural language.

2 The C-lem

2.1 The cliticization process characterized by the C-lem accepts for input pronominalized (ftn.2) declarative (ftn.3) active grammatical (ftn.4) structures such as (i):

(i) (Sbj) (V) (DO) to (IO) for (BO).
(ii) (DO) (beVen) by (Sbj) to (IO) for (BO).

The order of the constituent Prok's in the above structures is not functional in Modular Linguistics. What is of importance here is whether the verb in the structure is (V) or (beVen); for as observation of language data tends to indicate, passivated structures such as (ii) do not qualify as C-lem input and thus cannot undergo cliticization. Given this observation and to keep with current terminology, I have identified above under 1.1, as one and the same the semantic notion of Agent and the syntactic one of Subject; for in a declarative active structure both Agent and Subject refer to the same semantic entity. The same is also true of the general identification Patient/Object. In Modular Linguistics, however, C₁'s will denote semantic, while (Sbj, DO, IO, BO) will denote syntactic notions.

2.2 The C-lem proper is formed for each specific language according to the characteristics of the C₁-set of that language. These characteristics are different for different languages (cf. PCS-tables in Appendix); it follows then that the C-lem's are different for different languages. However, though different, they are so only in degree, not in substance; for they all can be shown to derive from a universal C-lem which is defined in terms both of its own operation and mechanism, and of its sublem architecture.

2.3 The universal C-lem requires the following assumptions of the language to which it belongs:

(a) that it be that of an adult speaker of the language (ftn.5).
(b) that it allow for the cliticization of all of BO, IO and DO pronouns in at least one and the same sentence. For the purposes of this paper 'Cliticization' is not to be confused with 'Pronominalization'. 'Cliticization' involves here the movement of pronominalized objects i.e. of pronouns, and their transformation thus into clitics.
(c) that it optionally allow for subject pronoun deletion and that it contain a C₁-clitic, e.g. Spanish, Albanian and Italian. Such languages will undergo what will be referred to as the operation of C₁-displacement (cf. KATHY below under 2.6 and in the Appendix).
2.4 The universal C-lem is a module whose building blocks are submodules $C_0$, $C_2^1$, $C_1$, $C_1^1$, $C_2$, $C_3$, $C_4$, and $C_5$ as defined above under 1.2 and arranged as in the following figure:

```
| $C_0^1$ | $C_5$ | $C_4$ | $C_3$ | $C_2$ | $C_1^1$ | $C_1$ | $C_2^1$ | $C_3^1$ |
```

$C_0^1$ is not conceived as a C-lem sublem, and the symbol (!) denotes a Pointer or Scanner whose movement within the C-lem is well-defined (cf. footnotes to SALWA and KATHY in the Appendix).

2.5 The universal C-lem simplifies to the language specific C-lem because not all of the $C_x^1$'s which form the universal C-lem are usually found to exist in the specific language under consideration. The language specific C-lems for English, Arabic, French and Spanish are shown in the Appendix, that for Walbiri is identical to that for English and Arabic. Notice the C-lem position relative the V-lem. The C-lem is inserted into that position after 'Pronominalization' but prior to 'Cliticization'.

2.6 The universal C-lem is depicted in blockdiagram in the Appendix. TURING is the program that describes the C-lem operation. It consists of an input block INTENT and of two subprogram blocks SALWA and KATHY. Due to space limitations I cannot undertake here the detailed description of the inner operations of these subprograms; the step by step derivations which are included in the Appendix will help the reader to meticulously follow these operations.

INTENT primarily registers which pronouns are to be cliticized and which are not. SALWA describes the cliticization operation proper and KATHY describes $C_1$-displacement.

Whereas SALWA is language universal, KATHY is, in terms of changes it effects on the form of $C_1$-clitics (cf. footnotes to KATHY in the Appendix) during and because of $C_1$-displacement, language specific. In terms of the operations underlying $C_1$-displacement proper, but not of the $C_1$-clitic surface form change occuring, KATHY is also language universal.

2.7 The language that best demonstrates the operation of the universal C-lem is Spanish. It meets assumptions (a), (b) and (c) noted above under 2.3 and it contains a $C_5$-clitic, namely 'se'. French does not meet assumption (c) and would make the demonstration easier. English, Arabic and Walbiri are in reference to their respective C-lems identical and three of the simpler languages. Walbiri differs though from English and Arabic in that it contains $C_0$-clitics while English and Arabic do not.

In the next section I shall discuss some derivations in English, Arabic, Walbiri, French and Spanish and I shall only advance a few comments on the remaining languages listed above under 0.3.

2 Derivations

2.1 General

2.1.1 In this section my main concern will be to acquaint the reader with the kind of derivations the modular C-lem approach provides us with.

The C-lem whose function is meticulously described by TURING is the only 'rule' controlling the cliticization process in all of the different languages considered here. It is thus a 'Universal of Language'. It is conceived of as being an
'obligatory rule' i.e. it must be gone through in any and all sentence derivations. The optionality of cliticizing one or more pronouns or none at all is a built-in TURING function provided for in INTENT.

3.1.2 I speak of an INTENT-input to denote the input sentence which is to undergo cliticization; of an INTENT-output feeding into a SALWA-input to denote the original sentence deemed by INTENT grammatical and candidate for cliticization, together with information as to which pronouns in it are to be cliticized; and of a TURING-output to denote the result of the overall cliticization process. The original sentence to undergo cliticization is thus deemed by TURING to be either cliticizable i.e. grammatical, in which case an output sentence O/GR is generated and printed out, or uncliticizable i.e. ungrammatical in which case the cliticization process has blocked somewhere and the information O/UNG is printed out.

3.1.3 The SALWA-input for each derivation is given as a parenthesized clitic quadruple \((c^1, c^1, c^1, c^1)\) in which a symbol '#' substituting for a 'C' will denote a disregard instruction DRG. Thus a SALWA-input candidate in French is \((#, l_e, l_u_l, m_e)\). Its TURING-output is the ordered quadruple 'me le lui' in which the symbol '#' has been disregarded. To indicate this input-output quadruple pair I shall write: \((#, l_e, l_u_l, m_e)/m_e l_e l_u_l\).

3.1.4 The French and Spanish derivation lists of all of Perlmutter's clitic sentences, only partially included in the Appendix to this paper, use the above notation. The tables entitled 'Clitic Order Matrix', C O M and COM, in the Appendix, list quadruple pair information, complete for English, Arabic, French and Spanish. Due to space limitations, tables of the remaining languages have not been included. For the assiduous scrutinizer, some actual step by step derivations have been provided. These show in complete detail the actual inner workings of the C-lem. Whereas the C O M's and COM's only list the ordered quadruple pair (SALWA-input)/TURING-output, these step by step derivations show in detail what happens inside the C-lem from the moment SALWA accepts input to the moment TURING delivers output. The code numbers listed under 'DERIVATION STEPS' in these step by step derivations refer successively to the 'program step addresses' given through in the derivation process. Such 'addresses' are marked next to each program step in the flowcharts of INTENT, SALWA and KATHY to be found in the Appendix. An example of one such derivation step is (S 18-19-20-25-GO TO KATHY K 1-2.). It indicates that the program has successively gone through SALWA steps 18-19-20-25, then switched over to KATHY and then continued through KATHY steps 1-2, where it momentarily stopped to perform a change in the C-lem content. The C-lem content change resulting from the derivation step is listed under 'SENTENCE' to the right of the derivation step line.

3.1.5 Throughout the remainder of this paper, each sentence will have its own identifying code number. An example of such a code number is (....)Fr(1)P(49/91) where:

(....) = Sentence identifying code in the present paper,
Fr = Language of the sentence under consideration, here French,
(1) = Sentence identifying number in the unpublished version of this paper.
P = (Perlmutter, 1971); name of work where sentence originally appeared.
English and Arabic

3.2.1 English is an obligatory-subject language and Arabic, though an optional-subject language, does not contain any C₁-clitics. Both languages, therefore, do not undergo C₁-displacement and KATHY is always bypassed.

With respect to their C-lem's, both languages are identical and two of the simpler ones. Because all of their clitics are without exception C₁'s, their C-lem's simplify as shown in the Appendix. As a result, where neither 'emphasis' nor 'contrast' are intended, both languages do not permit, in one and the same sentence, cliticization of more than one pronoun, namely, either Pro¹ or Pro² but never both together.

3.2.2 In the following examples of derivations '1' will denote the underlying structure US, '2' the pronominalized sentence, and '3' the cliticized sentence.

3.2.3

(E1 -1 ) I gave the book to Jane.
(E1 -2a ) I gave it₃ to Jane.
( b ) I gave the book to her₃.
( c ) I gave it₃ to her₃.
(E1 -3a ) (#,it,#,#)/it...... I gave it₃ to Jane.
( b ) (#,#,her,)#)/her.... I gave her₃ the book.
( c ) (#,it,her,#)/*......*I gave it₃ her₃.
( c' ) same..............*I gave her₃ it₃.

Notice that when emphasis or contrast are intended, Pro¹ which otherwise must cliticize, does not; and, given the right intonation, sentences paralleling (E1-3c') in their surface structure are acceptable. Notice however that in sentences such as these the DO though pronominalized is not and cannot be cliticized. Thus we have

(E1 -3c' ') (#,#,her,)#)/her.... I gave her₃ IT₃ (for emphasis).
(E1 -3' ) (#,#,him,)#)/him.... I give him₃ you₃ in marriage, not her₃.

3.2.4

(E2 -1a ) He brings the book in.
( a' ) ?He brings in the book.
( 2a ) He brings it₃ in.
( a' ) He brings in it₃.
( 3aa' ) (#,it,#,#)/it...... He brings it₃ in.
( 3aa'* ) same..................*He brings in it₃.

The derivation of (E2-3aa'* ) is impossible simply because the English C-lem is positioned directly to the right of the English V-lem, thus allowing no element whatsoever, e.g. 'in', to interfere between the both of them. Sentence (E2-2a') is ungrammatical as a final surface structure because DO, once pronominalized to Pro¹, must necessarily cliticize.

3.2.5

I gave the book to Jane.
Substitution of arabic 'ʔiyyaahu' for english Pro1 'it', of 'hu' for C1 'it' and of 'ha' for Pro2/C2 'her' yields:

(A1 -3a ) (#,h,#,#)/hu........ ?aʔaytu-hu_o li Jane.
       (b ) (#,#,h,#/ha...... ?aʔaytu-ha_c ?al kita:b.
       (c ) (#,h,#,#/*/........*?aʔaytu-hu_ha.. _
       (c' ) same.................*?aʔaytu-ha_c-hu_o.
       (c'' ) (#,#,h,#/ha...... ?aʔaytu-ha_c ʔiyyaahu_o
               (#,#,h,#/hu,hi...... ?uʔti-i_hi ʔiyyaarki_p ka'zawjat,
               wa iaysa ʔiyyaha_p. 
               I give him you as wife
               and not her .

2.2.6 In the above examples I have considered only the verb 'to give/?aʔay'. Other verbs could have served as well; except that not all verbs that allow Pro2-cliticization like 'to give/ 
?aʔay' match in English and Arabic. Thus while 'to write' in 
English allows Pro2-cliticization, its counterpart 'kataba' in 
Arabic does not. I cannot, however, consider here the reasons 
for this behaviour.

3.3 Walbiri

3.3.1 Given Perlmutter's data, Walbiri seems to be an obliga-
tory-subject language that however always simultaneously cliti-
cizes its sentence subject. It therefore does not undergo C1-
displacement. I have noted above under 2.7 that the walbiri 
C-lem is identical to that of English and Arabic. Strictly spea-
kling this is not completely true, although given the nature of 
the walbiri C-set that Perlmutter provides us with, the walbiri 
C-lem can simplify to the equivalent of the English and arabic 
one. The walbiri C-lem is theoretically identical to the french 
C-lem and like it, it is positioned before the V-lem. But con-
sider now the only Cl-clitic 'la_1' to equal 'la_0' instead, the 
walbiri C-lem will logically simplify to that of English and 
Arabic and at the same time remain in its function logically 
equivalent to the french C-lem when applied to the walbi-
ri C-set. In both the simplified and the unsimplified versions 
of the C-lem, Pro3 does not cliticize (cf.3.3.4 below).

3.3.2 In the following, the change 'la_1' to 'la' has been no-
ted and the resulting Perlmutter's (S1, S2, S3, P3) walbiri cli-
tics are respectively: C0 = (na_o,npa_o,∅_0,?), C1 = (tyu_4,nku_4, 
∅_0,tyana_y)) and C2 = (tyu_4,nku_4,la_o,tyana_y).

3.3.3 The following walbiri CClM predicts the surface clitic 
order in all of Perlmutter's walbiri sentences P(89.93/10.31): 
(C0,∅,C2,#)/C0C2, (C0,C1,#)/C0C1, (C0,C2,#)/C0C2 
and all others (C0,C1,C2,#)/.*

3.3.4 Kenneth Hale (1973) provides more complete data to allow 
for an in-depth study of the walbiri cliticization process. A 
first reading of Hale's paper tends to indicate that his data are 
C-lem predictable.

3.4 French

3.4.1 French is an obligatory-subject language and therefore 
does not undergo C1-displacement. Its C-lem is positioned di-
rectly before its V-lem. In a sense, it is a straightforward 
case for the demonstration of the C-lem action. It is neither 
as simple as English or Arabic nor nearly as complex as Spanish. 
In the following examples of derivations I have deleted the 
pronominalization step '2'.
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3.4.2 (F1-1)  

( 3a) (#,le₀,#,#/le  
Tu donnes le livre aux étudiants.  
You give the book to the students.  
Tu le donnes aux étudiants.  
Tu le donnes à eux  
Tu leur donnes le livre.  
Tu le leur donnes.

3.4.3 (F2-1)  

( 3a) (#,les₀,#,#/les  
Tu donnes les livres à moi.  
You give the books to me.  
Tu les donnes à moi.  
Tu me donnes les livres.  
Tu me les donnes.

3.4.4 (F3-1)  

( 3a) (#,te₄,#,#/te  
Je donnes toi à lui en mariage.  
I give you to him in marriage.  
Je te donnes à lui en mariage.  
*Je lui donnes toi en marriage.  
/lui; with emphasis or contrast intended.  
Je lui donnes TOI en mariage.  
.......et non pas Jane.  
*Je te lui donnes en mariage.

3.4.5 (F4-1)  

( 3a) (#,le,lui,te)/te le lui  
Je dirai cela à John pour toi.  
I will say this to John for you.

3.4.6 Comparison of (F3-3c) and (F4-3b) indicates that the clitic sequence 'te lui' is in and by itself neither grammatical nor ungrammatical.

3.4.7 Notice that if DO 'cela' is deleted in (F4-1) the sentence will be deemed ungrammatical by INTENT first constraint (/or#,NE_/)/*. Thus (F4-3c) (#,NE,lui,te)//*  
*Je te lui dirai.

Notice however that in this case the original US sentence is ungrammatical prior to C-lem entry. This is why I have noted in INTENT that the 'first constraints' might very well be superfluous.

3.4.8 The derivations of eight of Perlmutter's French sentences are given in the Appendix. Also, as indicated in the Appendix, notice that the set of clitics (me;te;noi;vous;se) which appears as a constituent in Perlmutter's surface structure constraint on French clitics P(57/121) exactly matches the French C₄-set according to the C-lem approach.

3.4.9 I have not considered here sentences in which the French clitics 'y' and 'en' appear P(59/124..130), nor sentences whose verb is a compound of two or more verbs, e.g. 'laisser voir/to let see' P(55/111..114), but it can be shown that these can be easily incorporated in the C-lem theory. All others of Perlmutter's French sentences are found to be C-lem predictable.

3.5 Spanish

3.5.1 Spanish is an optional-subject language and it contains a C₁-clitic. It therefore undergoes C₁-displacement i.e. KATHY comes into action here.

C₁-displacement achieves in Spanish what Perlmutter's 'spurious se rule' P(22/10) was set up to accomplish. Like the 'spurious se rule' C₁-displacement requires a C₁-clitic surface
form change. In Spanish it is the following: all $C_1$-clitics will change into 'se$_2$'.

3.5.2 $C_1$-displacement is, however, not to be equated with the 'spurious se rule'. For KATHY, which describes the function of $C_1$-displacement, is a universal process that applies not only in Spanish but also as well in Albanian and Italian, and in all other optional-subject languages containing a $C_1$-clitic, while the 'spurious se rule' does not make such a universal claim.

3.5.3 Unlike English, Arabic, Walbiri and French, Spanish raises the possibility that in one and the same sentence all of the four clitics in the SALWA-input quadruple might be marked by INTENT for cliticization. But as we can observe in Spanish CFTOM-13, (C$_0$C$_1$C$_2$C$_3$)/*, this cliticization is always ruled out as ungrammatical. This conclusion can be easily proven to follow logically from the TURING operation itself. Given my observations to this date, I can safely predict that in any and all languages the maximum number of clitics, of the kind that we are dealing with in this paper, that can appear together in one and the same sentence is 'THREE', and that this fact is a Universal of Language.

3.5.4 Observation of Spanish data P(51/94-95-96) reported in the Appendix, leads to the necessary conclusion that the Spanish two dialects reported by Perlmutter differ only in that in one dialect DI the clitic 'te' is C$_5$, while in the other DII it is C$_4$. In DI but not in DII 'te' is conceived of also as Sbj-clitic.

3.5.5 A derivation list of all of Perlmutter's Spanish sentences is available; it cannot, however, be included here. Relying upon this list, I can safely state that all of Perlmutter's Spanish sentences are C-lem predictable.

3.5.6 To state only a few observations: we now have an explanation for:

(a) the ambiguity of P(62/141) 'Te me recomendaron/(i) they recommended me to you, and (ii) they recommended you to me'. P(62/141) can derive from both (#,me,#,te) and (#,te,#,me).

(b) the ungrammaticality of sentences such as P(70/161b)
   '*Ramon me le complico la vida a mi hija, pero a mi hijo no se me la complico'. It is not ungrammatical due to clitic order considerations but due to what I have termed 'Semantic Clash', a notion not defined in this paper.

(c) the ungrammaticality of sentences such as P(76/174ab)
   '*Me lo queria seguir gritandomelo, and *Me lo queria seguir melo gritandomelo'. They are both ungrammatical due to the occurrence of the grammatical clitic sequence 'me lo' more than once in the sentence, with no apparent justification.

3.5.7 In the Appendix I have included derivations of and comments upon Perlmutter's sentences P(51/94-95-96). These, together with others not reported on here, prove beyond any doubt my contention that in Spanish DI 'te' is a C$_5$-subject clitic.

Here, a note is in order on the verb 'echar' which appears in P(51/95): In his 'Dictionary of the Spanish and English Languages', Velazquez (1967:1257-258) reports that 'the verb 'echar' is well described by a Spanish lexicographer as a verb of general utility; (and that) it serves frequently to assist the meaning of another verb, and (that) it enters into many phrases'; whereupon he lists over a hundred different meanings for 'echar' as it appears in different phrases. Some of these meanings translate into English reflexives, some do not. Given that P(51/95) 'Te me le echaste encima' translates into French as 'Tu me lui as sauté dessus' using the non-reflexive verb 'sauter/to jump', I translate
it into English as 'You jumped him over (on me)'. Notice that thus we have the lexical equivalence 'encima/dessus/over', and the syntactic quasi-equivalence of the sentence in the three languages. The Spanish sentence and its French translation are only semantically, but not syntactically, equivalent to Perlmutter's English translation 'You threw yourself on him on me'. Thus, I differ basically with Perlmutter in my interpretation of this sentence.

I have also included in the Appendix one of Emonds Spanish sentences as reported by Rivero (1973:698/1) 'El hombre que quiere lavarse se fue/The man who wants to wash himself left'. It is apparent that its derivation is a straightforward case of cliticization dealing not with one but with two C-lem's. (In Appendix text please correct 'to elope' so as to read 'to flee').

Due to space limitations, it is quite impossible to give the clitic problem in Spanish its due consideration here. Much has necessarily been left out, and the many predictions, explanations and foundations of ungrammaticality that it affords us with will have to wait for another forum.

Comments on the remaining languages

Albanian and Italian, like Spanish, are languages that undergo C1-displacement. Their respective C1-clitic surface form changes are indicated in the footnotes to KATHY in the Appendix. The Albanian clitic order is completely C-lem predictable. That of Italian is C-lem predictable except for one category of instances involving the clitic 'si'. This category of seemingly unpredictable instances can however be explained by incorporating an otherwise well-motivated principle into our theory of Language. Roughly, this principle states that 'the linguistic system of a specific language is, like Man himself, an adaptive system; and that it therefore tends to reach its optimal state of development by successively striking a middle ground between its own hardware/software structure and an optimal state of understanding and comprehension of its output messages by other like-systems in its own family'.

This principle, which I metaphorically term 'L-SURVIVAL', motivates us to incorporate a new rule specific to Italian and based on an extended notion of Homonymic Ambiguity', in order to completely explain and predict the Italian surface clitic order. In German, L-SURVIVAL has the effect that the C-lem allows only for Pro1-cliticization, never for Pro2; the result is that in German we are always dealing with a surface clitic order which is C1Pro2 and which happens to be homonymic with Pro1Pro2, i.e. in German, due to specific reasons not stated here, L-SURVIVAL opts for the simplification of the C-lem action. In French and Spanish, it is also L-SURVIVAL (if not pre-C-lem semantic constraints) that rules out all, except for one, identical i.e. homonymic surface sequences of clitics generated by the C-lem. In Russian, the C-lem can optionally be positioned either before or after the V-lem, and the surface clitic order is completely C-lem predictable. Work is in progress on Persian and Czech; and Japanese, Indonesian and Thai do not exhibit clitics of the kind we have been discussing here.
Concluding remarks

My involvement with the clitic problem stemmed mainly from a deep-seated dislike of mine of the notion of 'Surface Structure Constraints'. At the very moment I became aware of the existence in Linguistics of such a notion, I found that it not only disturbed my sense of scientific symmetry but also that it ran as well counter my sense of scientific logicity. For what are 'surface structure constraints' if not an easy backstage comeback to a quasi-tagnemicist view of how language phenomena are to be handled? The argument that, in Perlmutter's approach, surface structures have been 'generated' should not escape our scrutiny. Theoretically, the generation by any means of an infinity of surface structures of which the ungrammatical ones are to be ruled out by surface structure constraints, is simply equivalent to no more than just a description of the remaining grammatical surface structures of the language. No matter what the generation means are, if but one surface structure constraint of the kind Perlmutter proposes is allowed into linguistics, the fact will necessarily remain that such a linguistics will basically always be of the descriptive kind. I wholeheartedly agree with Suñer (1974:149-150) in her evaluation of surface structure constraints:

'...it is pertinent to ask about the explanatory power of a device such as SSC. It has none. A SSC does not explain anything. It is merely an expression of despair, like throwing one's arms up in the air and confessing that in spite of all the powerful machinery we have at our disposal, we are not able to filter out ill-formed sentences, so we give up and add an extra piece of machinery at the end of the production line in order to discard the 'bad sentences'.

In order to solve the clitic problem, I have developed in this paper, rudiments of a novel approach to research, namely that of a new modular linguistics methodology. I have also introduced a number of new notions, namely those of the 'clitic linguistic module, C-lem', of the L-SURVIVAL principle and of the surface feature of 'homonymic ambiguity' which I have shown to play the central role in the syntactic derivation of the surface clitic order in many languages. I have presented complete solutions to the clitic problem in English, Arabic, Waalbiri, French and Spanish; and I have indicated that the problem is solved in Albanian, Italian, German and Russian. Much, however, had to be left out.

The preponderance of evidence presented here in favor of the new theory cannot be denied. But the strength of the argument for Modular Linguistics and the C-lem mechanism lies not in that they explain clitic data, but in that they explain it not only across different languages, but also across different families of Language; and also in that the C-lem is a principled mechanism, only one in number, and not an ad-hoc pragmatic multitude of mechanisms. The strength of the argument points to a 'Universal of Language', and its challenge for the incorporation of this Universal, if at all possible, into the structure of current linguistic theories.

Generally, theories are always in a state of flux. At a certain point in time, a theory is perceived to be less than adequate if the unexplained data that it contains, the contradictions that it generates and the ad-hoc constraints that it requires greatly outweigh the explanations that it provides. Such is today the state of linguistic theory.
It is only when a new theory is introduced, that has the power to overwhelmingly explain the data, ease out the contradictions and do away with the ad-hoc constraints, that the old theory is proven wrong to the satisfaction of a new generation of researchers and in time discarded by them in favor of the newcomer. Such a new theory was at the basis of this presentation.

..................................CURTAIN.
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Notes
* This paper heavily relies on data appearing in (Perlmutter,1971). The reader is well-advised to consult Perlmutter's book in conjunction with this paper.
** 'The views of the author do not purport to reflect the position of the Department of the Army or the Department of Defense.'
(1) Dinnsen (1972) subsequently added to the notion of 'surface structure constraints' in Spanish, and to my knowledge Lakoff (1968) used it in at least one of his papers.
(2) Modular Linguistics will eventually allow cliticization to take place without pronominalization having first taken place. Some Spanish and some French sentences give good indication that the above might very well be the case.
(3) Although not covered here, imperative structures such as French 'Donne le lui/Give it to him' and 'Donne le moi/ Give it to me' are easily explained within the C-lem approach.
(4) Although in the final analysis the C-lem input will have to be grammatical - in the sense that structures whose underlying structure is itself ungrammatical prior to C-lem entry will not be generated and thus will not possibly become candidates for cliticization - , in this paper, I have built into the C-lem INTENT-block (cf.2.6 below) such mechanism as to rule out ungrammatical structures in the sense noted above. Such mechanism can however be completely omitted.
from INTENT without in the least affecting the C-lem overall function and output. The inclusion of such a mechanism here is due to the fact that the tables given in the Appendix to this paper, are duplicate copies of tables appearing in the unpublished preliminary version of this paper and that they could not be rewritten at this time. The same is also the reason why the 'current terminology' (Sbj,DO, IO,BO) and not the modular OX-terminology is used throughout. Such mechanism as noted above can be viewed as a double check on the grammaticality of C-lem input-structures without however carrying in the least any theoretical weight or meaning.

(5) The realm of a study interested in the possible evolution of the C-lem from child to adult speaker of the language is that of psycholinguistics and might prove to be very enlightening.
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The Appendix follows.....
HOMONYMIC AMBIGUITY, PRONOMINAL SYSTEMS AND THE CLITIC-LEM IN MODULAR LINGUISTICS

Post-meeting notes

1. A question was raised during the meeting concerning the notational semantic/syntactic identification Agent/Subject and Patient/Object discussed under 1.1, 2.1 and in ftn.4. So as to dispel any possible misunderstanding, the reader is kindly requested to read throughout (0⁰,0¹,0²,0³) for (Sbj,D0,I0,B0) respectively, keeping in mind that we are dealing here exclusively with semantic not syntactic categories, i.e. in all of the following three structures:
(a) John gave the book to Jane (for Jack).
(b) The book was given by John to Jane (for Jack).
(c) Jane was given the book by John (for Jack).

0⁰ is the semantic category relation that holds between 'John' and the verb 'to give'.
0¹ is the semantic category relation that holds between 'book' and the verb 'to give'.
0² is the semantic category relation that holds between 'Jane' and the verb 'to give'.
0³ is the semantic category relation that holds between 'Jack' and the verb 'to give'.

2. Contrary to what is stated under 2.1 some French passive structures can undergo cliticization, e.g. 'Le livre lui a été donné/ The book was given to him'. This paper deals however exclusively with active declarative structures and with this in mind its conclusions stand as stated.

3. The walbiri case discussed under 3.3 is not rigorously defined. Its description follows a permissible logical simplification that is however not explicitly stated. Its conclusions stand as stated.
FIRST CONSTRAINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF</th>
<th>DO/C₁</th>
<th>IO/C²</th>
<th>BO/C₃</th>
<th>THEN GOTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>SALWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/or#</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>SALWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/or#</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>SALWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/or#</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>SALWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/or#</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>O/UNG!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/or#</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>O/UNG!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/or#</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>O/UNG!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NO SENTENCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Unless BO can in some way be considered IO in the language, in which case GOTO SALWA.

(11) Unless the verb in the sentence is intransitive, in which case GOTO SALWA.

GENERAL:

(a) DO-pronoun always cliticizes except when emphasis is intended.
(b) IO-pronoun cliticizes if and only if DO-pronoun cliticizes, or DO appears in the sentence.
(c) IO-pronoun cliticizes if and only if either IO or DO is pronounalized and (d) holds true.
(d) IO-pronoun and/or DO-pronoun cliticizes.

(*) These first constraints may turn out to be universal and logically derivable from the C-len operation or otherwise they may turn out to be pre-C-len entry constraints. Also, as table indicates the underlying subject Sbj is assumed always to exist.

(**) Given the C-set for a specific language, it can logically be predicted whether DO-pronoun can or cannot cliticize into C⁴ in that language. As in the case in Arabic and English, this prediction allows for simplification in the construction of the C-len proper, where, as we shall see later, the C-sublen completely drops out. In order to prove this in truly the case, one must assure the existence of C-set clitics in the language under consideration and prove that they cannot possibly cliticize, for otherwise, without the stated assumption, one would just be begging the question. Thus one finds that while in French, Spanish and Albanian DO-pronouns do cliticize, they cannot possibly do so in Arabic or English. (Note that for all languages considered except for Czech the C-set is identical to the C⁴-set of clitics.)
(*) Movement of Scanner P (1):-
1- P-start is at $\text{C}_0^0$. (Logical simplification yields P-start at $\text{C}_0^0$)
   {in Spanish, $\text{C}_0^0$ in French and $\text{C}_0^0$ in both English and Arabic.}
2- From $\text{C}_0^0$ P moves right into the leftmost C-lem sublem.
3- P changes its direction of movement whenever it reaches a
   C-lem border sublem from within the C-lem itself.
4- P moves left whenever a 'block-sublem', (i), is introduced
   at P within the C-lem itself.
5- P cannot cross over a blocked sublem.

(**) Loop: - (This step might turn out to be superfluous.)
   If P performs a loop, i.e., if P returns to one and the same
   sublem after having changed its direction of movement without
   an 'insert-clitic' operation having taken place in the mean-
   while, then SALWA will output O/UNG.

(***) Step 17 is optional in some languages, e.g., Spanish and French.
   More specifically, when the pronoun is cliticized, it is the
   original object itself that usually appears in the sentence
   rather than the pronoun.

** For purely logical considerations step 8 should precede rather
than follow step 1). This, however, does in no way affect
the linguistic derivations presented in this paper.

The diagram [ ] denotes an operation to be performed, thus
read 1 instructs the system to read 1 in $\text{C}_1^1$, e.g., if $\text{C}_1^1 = \text{C}_1^1$, i = 1. The diagram [ ]
denotes a decision to be made by
the system, with two and only two possible outputs 'yes' or
'no'; thus $\text{N}$ asks whether $k = 1$; if $k = 1$ then the
output is 'yes', if $k \neq 1$ then the output is 'no'.

KATHY
** (*Language specific due to KATHY-steps K1.4 and K1.6.**

**)Language specific changes: C₁ ---- C₁*

always $g₁$ $g₁$
in Spanish $C₁$ $se = C₆$
in Italian $e₁$ $= e C₆$
in Albanian $C₁$ same but can undergo contraction

(***)R=0 means that P has not previously crossed over a non-vacant sublem.

R=1 means that P has previously crossed over a non-vacant sublem.

(****) When P is at the leftmost sublem of the C-lem, e.g., $C₆$ in Spanish and $C₁$ in Italian, then P cannot move left anymore and the output is 'NO'.

(*****At this point some clitics in Albanian will undergo contraction.
### Table 1: (English)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro^0</th>
<th>Sb^0</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>IO</th>
<th>BO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Derivation Steps

**Sentence**

Fred gave it to Jane.

**US**

Fred gave the book to Jane.

**Proclinalization**

I 1-2-3-4-5. GO TO SALMA.

**Example 1**

1. **Sb^0**: Fred
2. **DO**: it
3. **IO**: to
4. **BO**: Jane

**Flag**

* C^0: Subject
* C^1: Object
* C^2: Do
* C^3: IO

**Notes**

- All clitics are C^1, one and only one pronoun, namely either Pro^1 or Pro^2 but never both, can cliticize in one and the same sentence.
- C^1 and C^2 cliticize because of the second person pronoun.
- C^1 and C^2 cliticize because of logical considerations.

### Table 2: (Arabic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro^0</th>
<th>Sb^0</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>IO</th>
<th>BO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Derivation Steps

**Sentence**

Fred gave her the book.

**US**

Fred gave the book to Jane.

**Proclinalization**

I 1-2-3-4-5. GO TO SALMA.

**Example 2**

1. **Sb^0**: Fred
2. **DO**: her
3. **IO**: the book
4. **BO**: Jane

**Flag**

* C^0: Subject
* C^1: Object
* C^2: Do
* C^3: IO

**Notes**

- All clitics are C^1, one and only one pronoun, namely either Pro^1 or Pro^2 but never both, can cliticize in one and the same sentence.
- C^1 and C^2 cliticize because of the second person pronoun.
- C^1 and C^2 cliticize because of logical considerations.

---

**COM: Clitic Order Matrix**

Because all clitics are C^1, one and only one pronoun, namely either Pro^1 or Pro^2 but never both, can cliticize in one and the same sentence.

---

**COM: 3-equidistant drop out because of logical considerations**

(See next page...)

---

**COM: 3-equidistant drop out because of logical considerations**

(See next page...)

---

**COM: Clitic Order Matrix**

Because all clitics are C^1, one and only one pronoun, namely either Pro^1 or Pro^2 but never both, can cliticize in one and the same sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPQ</th>
<th>Sbj</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>IO</th>
<th>BO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro^0</td>
<td>c^0</td>
<td>Pro^1</td>
<td>c^1</td>
<td>Pro^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>moi</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>toi</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>S3M</td>
<td>il</td>
<td>lui</td>
<td>le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>S3F</td>
<td>elle</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>lui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>nous</td>
<td>nous</td>
<td>nous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>vous</td>
<td>vous</td>
<td>vous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>S3M</td>
<td>eux</td>
<td>eux</td>
<td>eux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>S3F</td>
<td>elles</td>
<td>elles</td>
<td>elles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>moi-moi</td>
<td>moi</td>
<td>moi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-5H | Pro-moi-moi | moi | moi |

\[ c^0 \rightarrow c^0 \rightarrow c^1 \rightarrow c^2 \rightarrow c^3 \rightarrow V-len \]

FRENCH: DG: C-len

- (c^0 c^2)

1. - (c^1 c^2)

2. - (c^1 c^3)

3. - (c^2)

4. - (c^2)

5. - (c^3 c^2)

\[ c^1 \rightarrow c^2 \rightarrow c^3 \rightarrow V-len \]

PS: Identical on the surface are elements marked '0' and elements marked '1'.

PS: The ungrammatical sentence 'Fred gave her to her' has the same blocked derivation as (EngDer.1) with pronominalization but not cliticization of DO for reasons of emphasis as noted in the text. To indicate emphasis we could write the sentence as 'Fred gave her, IT'...

Notice that emphasis of DO-pronoun here is achieved by de-emphasizing 10-pronoun through cliticization.

PS: The derivation of the ungrammatical sentence 'He brings in it' is impossible simply because the C-len in English is positioned directly after the verb thus allowing no element to interfere in between the two of them.

The sentence 'He brings in it_p' or 'He brings in IT_p' is grammatical as the output of Pronominalization only if emphasis of DO-pronoun is intended, (See PS of (EngDer.3))
(FrDer,1'):

Je te get lu, dirai cela.
I you him will say this.
I will say this to him for you.

SENTENCE

DERIVATION STEPS

Same as (FrDer,1) but without pronominalization of DO 'cela'.
See (FrDer,1)').

Note that the sequence 'te lui' is not ungrammatical here, while it
is ungrammatical in (FrDer,1').

(FrDer,1''): -

Je te get lu, dirai.
I you him will say.
I will say this to him for you.

SENTENCE

DERIVATION STEPS

Us Pronominalization and
-2-3-4, same as (FrDer,1'),
but with the exception that here from the beginning DO is set the
value NO. At INTENT output
0/UGN according to the condition:
- i.e. the sequence 'te lui'
is ungrammatical here. (See text).

REFERENCE # | 'SALWA'-INPUT | 'TURING'- | PERLMUTTER'S FRENCH SENTENCES
--- | --- | --- | ---
F(1)P(49/91) | le vous# vous le | Gertrude vous le donnera.
F(2)P(49/92) | le lui | le lui | Gertrude le lui donnera.
F(3)P(53/103) | le # | le | Roger l'aurait recommande a toi, par Jean.
F(3)P(53/103) | le te # | le te | Roger te l'aurait recommande.
F(5)P(53/103) | le nous# | nous# | Roger nous aurait recommande toi.
F(6)'P(53/105) | (nous) | (le) | *Roger (nous mp') aurait recommande.
F(7)'P(53/108) | (us) | (te sa) | *Roger (you we') aurait recommande.
F(8)'P(53/109) | (vous) | (te) | *Roger (you we') recommande.

COMMENT ON:
F(1)'P(37/121)

Perlmutter's SSC on french citation:
- Nom (me) III III y en ' (te) Acc Dat
- (nous) (to)
- (us)

Notice that in the above SSC the component
(me,te,nous,vous,se) is exactly the french
C-set according to the C-lem theory. (See text)
### SPANISH: PRONOMINAL AND CLITIC SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPO</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>PRO^0</th>
<th>PRO^1</th>
<th>PRO^2</th>
<th>PRO^3</th>
<th>PRO^4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>el</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>ella</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
<td>nosotros</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>ellos</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>nos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPANISH: COM: (for C^0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C^0</th>
<th>C^1</th>
<th>C^2</th>
<th>C^3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c^1</td>
<td>c^1</td>
<td>c^1</td>
<td>c^1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPANISH: C^0-CONJ. (for C^0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C^0</th>
<th>C^1</th>
<th>C^2</th>
<th>C^3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c^3</td>
<td>c^3</td>
<td>c^3</td>
<td>c^3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPANISH: C^0-C# (C^0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C^0</th>
<th>C^1</th>
<th>C^2</th>
<th>C^3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c^1</td>
<td>c^2</td>
<td>c^3</td>
<td>c^4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPANISH: C^0-C# (C^#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C^0</th>
<th>C^1</th>
<th>C^2</th>
<th>C^3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c^1</td>
<td>c^2</td>
<td>c^3</td>
<td>c^4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPANISH: C^0-C# (C^0-C^#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C^0</th>
<th>C^1</th>
<th>C^2</th>
<th>C^3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c^1</td>
<td>c^2</td>
<td>c^3</td>
<td>c^4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. "#" means grammatical because 'te' and 'te]' belong to different dialects and can never co-occur in the same sentence.
A los generales es lea, de los honores,...

To the generals, 'Pro' then gives the honor.....

(To the generals, 'Pro' gives the honor to them......

(Fr:Aux generaux, on leur donne les honoires......)

SENTENCE

A los generales es lea, de los honores.....

To the generals 'Pro' gives the honor.....

A los generales, we de a ellos, los honores.....

(To the generals, 'Pro' gives to them the honors......
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These sentences provide the proof for the existence of a Subject-clitic "te". It follows from the C-les theory that Subject-clitics "te" must necessarily be "te", i.e., in the difference between three and not only two dialects of Spanish--DII recognizes it as Subject-clitic and marks it "te", DII does not recognize it as Subject-clitic and marks it "te". DII marks Subject-clitic which accepts "te" as Subject-clitic "te", i.e., according to the sentence to which it occurs. Example of DII are sentences (59) and (60). Examples of DII are sentences (59) and (60). Examples of DII are sentences (59) and (60). Examples of DII are sentences (59) and (60).